

1 Janet Lindner Spielberg (SBN 221926)
 2 **LAW OFFICES OF JANET**
LINDNER SPIELBERG
 3 12400 Wilshire Boulevard, #400
 Los Angeles, California 90025
 4 Tel: (310) 392-8801
 Fax: (310) 278-5938
 Email: jlspielberg@jlslp.com

5 Michael D. Braun (SBN 167416)
 6 **BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.**
 7 10680 West Pico Boulevard, Suite 280
 Los Angeles, California 90064
 Tel: (310) 836-6000
 8 Fax: (310) 836-6010
 Email: service@braunlawgroup.com

9 **ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF**

10
 11 Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Wyatt A. Lison (admitted *pro hac vice*)
FEINSTEIN DOYLE PAYNE
& KRAVEC LLC
 12 Allegheny Building, 17th Floor
 13 429 Forbes Avenue
 Pittsburgh, PA 15219
 Tel: (412) 281-8400
 Fax: (412) 281-1007
 Email: jkraivec@fdpklaw.com
 Email: wlison@fdpklaw.com

14
 15 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 16
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18
 19 KIMBERLY S. SETHAVANISH, on behalf of
 herself and all others similarly situated,

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 ZONEPERFECT NUTRITION COMPANY, a
 23 Delaware corporation,

24 Defendant.

25
 26 CASE NO.: 3:12-CV-02907 SC
27 CLASS ACTION

28
29 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT

30 Date: November 8, 2013
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Location: Courtroom 1, 17th Floor

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

2	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION	1
3	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT	2
4	I. INTRODUCTION	2
5	II. COMMON EVIDENCE ADDUCED TO DATE	4
6	A. ZonePerfect Used Common Labels and Identical Misrepresentations on Its Nutrition Bars' Labels Throughout the Class Period.....	4
7	B. ZonePerfect Used Common Non-Natural Ingredients in the Nutrition Bars Throughout the Class Period.....	4
8	C. Common Evidence Establishes that "All-Natural" is Unlawful and Signifies To Consumers the Absence of Synthetic Ingredients	6
9	D. Common Evidence Shows that ZonePerfect's "All-Natural" Claim Is Material To Purchasers' Decision to Buy Nutrition Bars	8
10	E. Additional Common Evidence Corroborates The Materiality of ZonePerfect's "All- Natural" Claims	9
11	F. ZonePerfect's Nutrition Bars Are A Single Product Line	10
12	G. Class-wide Relief Can Be Proved on a Common Basis	11
13	III. THIS COURT CAN CERTIFY A NATIONWIDE CLASS AS ZONEPERFECT'S CONDUCT EMANATES FROM CALIFORNIA	12
14	IV. THE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO FED.R.CIV.P. 23(a) AND 23(b)(3) ARE MET	12
15	A. Standard	12
16	B. Rule 23(a)(1) – Numerosity	13
17	C. Rule 23(a)(3) – Typicality	14
18	D. Rule 23(a)(4) – Adequacy of Representation	15
19	E. Rule 23(a)(2) Commonality / Rule 23(b)(3) Predominance	16
20	1. Common Questions Exist for Plaintiff and the Class	17

1	2.	Common Questions of Law Predominate As To Plaintiff's Consumer	18
2		Protection Claims.....	
3	3.	Common Questions of Law Predominate As To Plaintiff's Common Law Fraud	20
4		and Quasi Contract Claims	
5	4.	Individual Issues of Damages Do Not Predominate	21
6	F.	Rule 23(b)(3) – Superiority.....	21
7	1.	Rule 23(b)(3)(A)	21
8	2.	Rule 23(b)(3)(B)	22
9	3.	Rule 23(b)(3)(C)	22
10	4.	Rule 23(b)(3)(D)	22
11	V.	CONCLUSION.....	23
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1
2
3 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28CASES

<i>Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997)	17
<i>Astiana v. Dreyers Grand Ice Cream, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 2990766, (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2012)	10, 11
<i>Beck-Ellman v. Kaz USA, Inc.</i> , 283 F.R.D. 558 (S.D. Cal. 2012)	passim
<i>Blackie v. Barrack</i> , 524 F.2d 891 (9th Cir. 1975).....	21
<i>Bruno v. Eckart Corp.</i> , 280 F.R.D. 540 (C.D. Cal. 2012)	12
<i>Carnegie v. Household Int'l, Inc.</i> , 376 F.3d 656 (7th Cir. 2004)	21, 22
<i>Cf. Comcast v. Behrend</i> , --- S.Ct. ----, 2013 WL 1222646 (2013)	21
<i>Chavez v. Blue Sky Natural Beverage Co.</i> , 268 F.R.D. 365 (N.D.Cal 2010)	passim
<i>City of Atascadero v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.</i> , 68 Cal. App. 4th 445, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329, 354 (1998).....	20
<i>Coopers & Lybrand v. Livesay</i> , 437 U.S. 463 (1978).....	13
<i>Eisen v. Carlisle & Jacquelin</i> , 417 U.S. 156 (1974).....	13
<i>Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> , 657 F.3d 970 (9th Cir.2011)	13
<i>Gafcon, Inc. v. Ponsor & Assocs.</i> , 98 Cal. App. 4th 1388 (Cal. Ct. App. 2002).....	19
<i>Gay v. Waiters' & Dairy Lunchmen's Union</i> , 549 F.2d 1330 (9th Cir.1977)	13
<i>Gen. Tel. Co. v. Falcon</i> , 457 U.S. 147 (1982)	13, 16
<i>Guido v. L'Oreal, USA, Inc.</i> , 284 F.R.D. 468 (C.D. Cal. 2012).....	21
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)	14, 15, 17
<i>Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.</i> , 976 F.2d 497 (9th Cir.1992).....	14
<i>Harris v. Palm Springs Alpine Estates, Inc.</i> , 329 F.2d 909 (9th Cir.1964)	13
<i>Haynes v. Logan Furniture Mart, Inc.</i> , 503 F.2d 1161 (7th Cir. 1974).....	22
<i>Holk v. Snapple Beverage Corp.</i> , 575 F.3d 329 (3d Cir. 2009).....	7
<i>Ikonen v. Hartz Mountain Corp.</i> , 122 F.R.D. 258 (S.D. Cal. 1998)	13
<i>In re Emulex Corp.</i> , 210 F.R.D. 717 (C.D. Cal. 2002)	16
<i>In re Ferrero</i> , 278 F.R.D. 552 (S.D. Cal. 2011)	3, 16, 18

1	<i>In re POM Wonderful</i> , 2012 WL 4490860 (C.D.Cal. 2012)	3, 12, 18
2	<i>In re Steroid Hormone Prod. Cases</i> , 181 Cal.App.4th 145 (Cal. Ct. App. 2010)	19
3	<i>In re Tobacco II Cases</i> , 46 Cal.4th 298 (Cal. 2009).....	19
4	<i>In re Worldcom Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 219 F.R.D. 267 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).....	22
5	<i>Johns v. Bayer Corp.</i> , 280 F.R.D. 551 (S.D.Cal., 2012).....	3, 15, 18, 21
6	<i>Johnson v. General Mills, Inc.</i> , 276 F.R.D. 519 (C.D.Cal.2011)	3, 18
7	<i>Jordan v. Paul Financial, LLC</i> , 285 F.R.D. 435 (N.D.Cal. 2012)	23
8	<i>Klaxon Co. v. Stentor Elec. Mfg. Co.</i> , 313 U.S. 487 (1941).....	12
9	<i>Koh v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 94265 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2010)	10
10	<i>Kwikset Corp. v. Sup. Ct.</i> , 51 Cal.4th 310 (Cal. 2011)	10
11	<i>Larsen v. Trader Joe's Co.</i> , --- F.Supp.2d ----, 2013 WL 132442 (N.D.Cal., 2013).....	6
12	<i>Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co v. Sup. Ct.</i> , 97 Cal. App. 4th 1282 (Cal. Ct. App. 2002).....	19
13	<i>Mazza v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , Inc., 666 F.3d 581 (9th Cir. 2012)	12
14	<i>McKell v. Washington Mut., Inc.</i> , 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457 (2006)	20
15	<i>Moore v. Hughes Helicopters, Inc.</i> , 708 F.2d 475 (9th Cir.1983).....	13
16	<i>Motors, Inc. v. Times Mirror Co.</i> , 102 Cal. App. 3d 735 (Cal. Ct. App. 1980)	18
17	<i>Pacific States Box & Basket Co. v. White</i> , 296 U.S. 176 (1935).....	5
18	<i>Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts</i> , 472 U.S. 797, 105 S. Ct. 2965, 86 L. Ed. 2d 628 (1985)	22
19	<i>Rodriguez v. Hayes</i> , 591 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir.2010)	14, 17
20	<i>Rogge v. U. S.</i> , 128 F.2d 800 (9th Cir. 1942).....	5
21	<i>South Bay Chevrolet v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp.</i> , 72 Cal. App. 4th 861 (Cal. Ct. App. 1999)	18
22	<i>Staton v. Boeing Co.</i> , 327 F.3d 938 (9th Cir.2003)	15
23	<i>Stearns v. Ticketmaster Corp.</i> , 655 F.3d 1013 (9th Cir. 2011).....	19
24	<i>Swanson v. American Consumer Indus</i> , 415 F.2d 1326 (7th Cir. 1969).....	13
25	<i>Vasquez v. Superior Court</i> , 4 Cal. 3d 800, 814, 484 P.2d 964 (1971).....	20
26	<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> , 131 S.Ct. 2541 (2011).....	12, 16, 17
27	<i>Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court</i> , 24 Cal.4th 906, 103 Cal.Rptr.2d 320, 15 P.3d 1071 (Cal 2001).....	12
28		

1	<i>West v. Circle K Stores, Inc.</i> , 2006 WL 1652598 (E.D. Cal. June 12, 2006)	22
2	<i>Williams v. Gerber Prods.</i> , 552 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2008)	19
3	<i>Zeisel v. Diamond Foods, Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 2221113 (N.D.Cal., 2011).....	3, 16, 18
4	<i>Zinser v. Accufix Research Inst., Inc.</i> , 253 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir.2001)	12
5	<u>STATUTES</u>	
6	21 U.S.C. § 301.....	3
7	21 U.S.C. § 343(a)(1).....	18
8	Cal.Civ.Code § 1770(a)(5).....	19
9	Cal.Civ.Code § 1770(a)(7).....	19
10	Cal.Civ.Code § 1770(a)(9).....	19
11	Cal. Health & Safety Code § 110660.....	3, 18
12	California Business & Professions Code 17500	3
13	California's Business and Professions Code section 17200	3
14	<u>RULES</u>	
15	Fed.R.Civ.P. 23	13
16	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)	1, 12, 13, 15
17	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1).....	13, 14
18	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2).....	7, 18
19	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3).....	14
20	Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(2).....	18
21	Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(3).....	14
22	Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(4).....	15
23	Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(b)(3).....	passim
24	Rule 23(b)(3)(A)	21
25	Rule 23(b)(3)(B)	22
26	Rule 23(b)(3)(C)	22
27	Rule 23(b)(3)(D)	22, 23

1	Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(g)(1).....	4
2	<u>REGULATIONS</u>	
3	21 C.F.R. § 172.515	5
4	21 C.F.R. § 172.842	5
5	21 C.F.R. § 172.866.....	5
6	21 C.F.R. § 178.3500.....	5
7	21 C.F.R. § 182.3890	5
8	21 C.F.R. § 184.1212.....	5
9	21 C.F.R. § 184.1676.....	5
10	21 C.F.R. § 184.1890	5
11	62 Fed. Reg. 49826, 49841	7
12	7 C.F.R. § 205.605(b)	5

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO DEFENDANT AND ITS ATTORNEYS OF RECORDS:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, on November 8, 2013, at 10:00 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard by the above-captioned Court located at 450 Golden Gate Ave., 17th Floor, Courtroom 1, San Francisco, California 94102, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3), Plaintiff Kimberly S. Sethavanish will and hereby does move this Court to certify her claims against Defendant ZonePerfect Nutrition Company (“Defendant” or “ZonePerfect”), based upon its false and misleading labeling of its All-Natural Nutrition Bars as “All-Natural,” when those nutrition bars contained synthetic ingredients, to appoint Plaintiff Kimberley S. Sethavanish as class representative, and to appoint the following attorneys as Class Counsel: Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. of Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC, Michael D. Braun of the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Janet Lindner Spielberg of the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg.¹

Plaintiff moves this Court to certify her claims on behalf of a Class defined as:

All persons who purchased ZonePerfect Nutrition Company's All-Natural Nutrition Bars in the United States on or after September 14, 2007 that were labeled "All-Natural" but which contained one or more of the following non-natural ingredients: Ascorbic Acid, Calcium Pantothenate, Calcium Phosphate, Glycerine, Cocoa Processed with Alkali, Pyridoxine Hydrochloride, Disodium Phosphate, Sorbitan Monostearate, Tocopherols or Xanthan Gum.

Excluded from the Class are: (i) ZonePerfect and its employees, principals, affiliated entities, legal representatives, successors and assigns; and (ii) the judges to whom this action is assigned and any members of their immediate families.

The proposed Class is certifiable under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(3), as Plaintiff's and the Class's claims are each based upon Defendant's standardized misconduct in falsely and misleadingly labeling its Nutrition Bars in violation of the Federal Food Drug and Cosmetic Act, as amended, and California law.

The Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying Memorandum and Points of Authorities in Support of Motion for Class Certification, the Declaration of Joseph N. Kravec,

¹ If this Court determines that nationwide certification is not appropriate, Plaintiff moves in the

1 Jr. in Support of the Motion for Class Certification, the Proposed Order, the files and records in this
 2 case, and such argument and further filings and evidence as this Court may receive on this Motion.
 3

4 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

5 **I. INTRODUCTION**

6 Plaintiff Kimberly S. Sethavanish (“Plaintiff”) seeks nationwide (or alternatively multi-state or
 7 state-wide) certification of her claims in this class action against ZonePerfect Nutrition Company
 8 (“ZonePerfect”) on behalf of herself and a Class defined as: All persons who purchased ZonePerfect
 9 Nutrition Company’s Nutrition Bars in the United States on or after September 14, 2007 that were
 10 labeled “All-Natural” but which contained one or more of the following non-natural ingredients:
 11 Ascorbic Acid, Calcium Pantothenate, Calcium Phosphate, Glycerine, Cocoa Processed with Alkali,
 12 Pyridoxine Hydrochloride, Disodium Phosphate, Sorbitan Monostearate, Tocopherols or Xanthan Gum.
 13 ¶¶ 1, 52^{2,3}.

14 Plaintiff was harmed by this false and misleading labeling as she purchased the ZonePerfect
 15 nutrition bars (hereafter “Nutrition Bars”) believing that the ingredients in them were “All-Natural” as
 16 the labels represented. Unbeknownst to the Plaintiff, and the class of consumers she seeks to represent,
 17 they did not receive the “All-Natural” Nutrition Bars they paid for. ¶ 8. Despite the “All-Natural”
 18 labeling, [REDACTED]

19 [REDACTED] Kravec Decl. Exhibit 3. Through the use of this false and misleading labeling,
 20 ZonePerfect has been able to sell these Nutrition Bars as “All-Natural,” despite containing synthetic

23 alternative for certification of her claims on behalf of state or multi-state classes.

24 ² All “¶” references are to Plaintiff’s Class Action Complaint, and at all times emphasis is added and
 25 citations are omitted unless otherwise indicated. A copy of the Complaint is attached to ZonePerfect’s
 26 Notice of Removal (Dkt. No. 1). This copy is black-and-white, difficult to view clearly and omits the
 27 Complaint’s exhibits. As such, Plaintiff has attached a color copy of the Complaint and its exhibits.
 28 See Kravec Decl. Exhibit 2.

³ The ZonePerfect products are shown and listed at ¶ 42, and exemplars of the corresponding “All-
 27 Natural” labels are at Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. in Support of Plaintiff’s
 28 Motion for Class Certification (“Kravec Decl.”) filed herewith.

1 substances, to thousands of unsuspecting consumers in California and throughout the United States. ¶
 2 3.⁴

3 Courts within this Circuit and in this District routinely certify litigation classes for similar food
 4 and other product mislabeling claims. *See, e.g., In re POM Wonderful Marketing and Sales Practices*
 5 *Litig.*, No. ML 10-02199 DDP, 2012 WL 4490860, *1 (C.D.Cal. Sept. 28, 2012); *Beck-Ellman v. Kaz*
 6 *USA, Inc.*, 283 F.R.D. 558, 564 (S.D.Cal. 2012); *Johns v. Bayer Corp.*, 280 F.R.D. 551, 559 (S.D.Cal.,
 7 2012); *In re Ferrero*, 278 F.R.D. 552, 556 (S.D.Cal. 2011); *Johnson v. General Mills, Inc.*, 276 F.R.D.
 8 519, 521 (C.D.Cal.2011); *Zeisel v. Diamond Foods, Inc.*, No. C 10-01192 JSW, 2011 WL 2221113, *1
 9 (N.D.Cal. June 7, 2011); *Chavez v. Blue Sky Natural Beverage Co.*, 268 F.R.D. 365, 369 (N.D.Cal
 10 2010). The predominately common evidence adduced in this case similarly supports certification of a
 11 nationwide class here.

12 While fact discovery is ongoing, evidence adduced to date demonstrates that Class members'
 13 claims each arise from ZonePerfect's uniform course of conduct, and that all the factual issues
 14 necessary to resolve Plaintiff's and class members' dispute with ZonePerfect are common issues that
 15 can be proven on a class-wide basis through documents, testimony of key corporate personnel, and
 16 publically available consumer research and marketing studies. Specifically, the evidence shows
 17 throughout the class period that: 1) the Nutrition Bars had common labels containing common "All-
 18 Natural" misrepresentations; 2) the Nutrition Bars contained common non-natural synthetic
 19 ingredients; 3) the Nutrition Bars' "All-Natural" claim signifies to consumers the absence of non-
 20 natural synthetic ingredients; 4) according to ZonePerfect's own records and corporate representative
 21 testimony, the "All-Natural" claim is material to consumers' decision to purchase food products such
 22 as the Nutrition Bars; 5) Plaintiff purchased ZonePerfect's Nutrition Bars with the materially identical
 23 "All-Natural" label as all other class members; 6) the restitution, restitutionary disgorgement and

24
 25 ⁴ Based upon the above, Plaintiff alleges that ZonePerfect's false and misleading conduct violates the
 26 Food Drug & Cosmetic Act ("FDCA"), 21 U.S.C. § 301 *et seq.*, as amended, and California's Sherman
 27 Food, Drug and Cosmetic Law ("Sherman Law"), Cal. Health & Safety Code § 110660. Plaintiff
 28 further alleges that ZonePerfect's conduct violates the unlawful, unfair and fraudulent prongs of
 California's Business and Professions Code section 17200, *et. seq.* (the "UCL"), the California
 Business & Professions Code 17500 *et. seq.* (the "FAL"), the Consumer Legal Remedies Act
 ("CLRA"), and common law fraud. In the alternative, Plaintiff also brings a claim for restitution based
 on quasi contract. Plaintiff does not seek certification of the MMWA claim this Court dismissed. Dkt.

1 damages through the price premium paid for the “All-Natural” Nutrition Bars sought for Plaintiff’s
 2 class claims can be determined through available records of units sold, revenue, costs, profits and
 3 average retail prices; and 7) ZonePerfect’s conduct at issue substantially emanated from California
 4 where ZonePerfect manufactured and labeled all of the Nutrition Bars at issue in this case.

5 As further detailed below, the predominantly common evidence adduced to date shows that
 6 Plaintiff has met all of the requirements of Rule 23(a) and 23(b)(3). Therefore, Plaintiff respectfully
 7 requests that this Court certify the proposed Class, appoint Plaintiff as Class Representative for the
 8 Class, and appoint Plaintiff’s Counsel as Class Counsel for the Class pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P.
 9 23(g)(1).

10 **II. COMMON EVIDENCE ADDUCED TO DATE**

11 **A. ZonePerfect Used Common Labels and Identical Misrepresentations on Its
 12 Nutrition Bars’ Labels Throughout the Class Period**

13 Discovery to date establishes that ZonePerfect used common, materially identical labels
 14 with uniform “All-Natural” misrepresentations on each of the Nutrition Bars since before the beginning
 15 of the class period (i.e., September 14, 2007).⁵ *See ¶ 42, Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 (Labels); Kravec Decl.*
 16 *Exhibit 4, deposition of ZonePerfect through Kimberly Casey pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6)*
 17 *(“Casey Dep.”) at 87:24 – 88:7. [REDACTED]*

18 [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 85:24 – 86:17.

19 **B. ZonePerfect Used Common Non-Natural Ingredients in the Nutrition Bars
 20 Throughout the Class Period**

21 ZonePerfect sells and markets a selection of purportedly “All-Natural” Nutrition Bars. *See ¶ 42,*
 22 *Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 (Labels); ZonePerfect’s Amended Answer to Plaintiff’s Complaint (“Answer”)*
 23 *(Dkt. 58) ¶¶ 2, 40, 41, 44, 48, 49.* Belying the “All-Natural” claim, however, ZonePerfect used
 24 common non-natural, synthetic substances throughout the class period in the Nutrition Bars. ¶¶ 1-2, 21-
 25 30, 42; Answer ¶¶ 2, 42; Kravec Decl. Exhibit 8 (Table of Unnatural Ingredients and Applicable
 26 Regulations). In particular, discovery confirms that ZonePerfect has included Ascorbic Acid, Calcium

27 No. 38.

28 ⁵ The class period runs from September 14, 2007, *i.e.*, four years prior to Plaintiff filing of her original
 complaint against ZonePerfect. *See ¶ 1.*

1 Pantothenate, Calcium Phosphate, Glycerine, [REDACTED]⁶ Pyridoxine
 2 Hydrochloride, Disodium Phosphate, Sorbitan Monostearate, Tocopherols or Xanthan Gum in its
 3 purportedly "All-Natural" Nutrition Bars throughout the class period. *See* ¶ 42; Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1
 4 (Labels).

5 Each of these identified substances, which ZonePerfect consistently used in the Nutrition Bars,
 6 is decried by federal regulations as synthetic, (i.e., non-natural).⁷ *See* Kravec Decl. Exhibit 8 (Chart of
 7 Applicable Regulations); Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 (Labels with ingredients); ¶¶ 21 – 30 (identifying non-
 8 natural ingredients); ¶ 42 (identifying non-natural ingredients in each of ZonePerfect's Nutrition Bars);
 9 Kravec Decl. at 74 (chart of non-natural ingredients in ZonePerfect's Nutrition Bars). These
 10 regulations determine the nature of various substances which constitute regulatory findings of fact and
 11 create a strong evidentiary presumption in Plaintiff's favor that these substances are synthetic. *See*
 12 *Morgan v. U.S.*, 298 U.S. 468, 477 (1936) ("When the Secretary acts within the authority conferred by
 13 the statute, his findings of fact are conclusive."); *Pacific States Box & Basket Co. v. White*, 296 U.S.
 14 176, 185-86 (1935); *Rogge v. U. S.*, 128 F.2d 800, 803 (9th Cir. 1942). [REDACTED]
 15 [REDACTED]
 16 [REDACTED] Kravec Decl. Exhibit 3
 17 ([REDACTED]); Kravec Decl. Exhibit 10 ("[REDACTED]
 18 [REDACTED]
 19 [REDACTED]). However, should additional factual
 20 proof of the nature of the ingredients be needed, Plaintiff is able to show on a common basis through
 21 [REDACTED]

22 ⁶ Plaintiff alleged the Cocoa [processed with alkali] used in ZonePerfect's Nutrition Bars were alkalinized
 23 with Potassium Carbonate or another non-natural alkalinizing agent. ¶ 25 and fn. 17. Discovery
 24 confirmed that [REDACTED] *See* Kravec Decl., Exhibit 9,
 25 ZonePerfect's Answer to Plaintiff's Interrogatory No. 5.

26 ⁷ *See* Kravec Decl. Exhibit 8 citing 7 C.F.R. § 205.605(b) ([REDACTED], Ascorbic Acid,
 27 Calcium Phosphates, Glycerine, Potassium Carbonate, Disodium Phosphate, Tocopherols, Xanthan
 28 Gum); 21 C.F.R. § 184.1212 (Calcium Pantothenate); 21 C.F.R. § 172.866 (Glycerin); 21 C.F.R. §
 178.3500 (Glycerin); [REDACTED]; 21 C.F.R. § 182.3890 (Tocopherols); 21 C.F.R. § 184.1676 (Pyridoxine Hydrochloride);
 21 C.F.R. § 172.842 (Sorbitan Monostearate); 21 C.F.R. § 172.515 (Sorbitan Monostearate); 21 C.F.R.

1 ZonePerfect's suppliers that the ingredients are artificial or synthetic by showing how they are made.

2 **C. Common Evidence Establishes that "All-Natural" is Unlawful and Signifies
3 To Consumers the Absence of Synthetic Ingredients**

4 Available common evidence, including statements by the FDA, comments to formal regulations,
5 and records from ZonePerfect establishes that food containing synthetic vitamins and other ingredients
6 are not "All-Natural."

7 The FDA explicitly stated that synthetic vitamins such as the Ascorbic Acid (synthetic Vitamin
8 C), Pyridoxine Hydrochloride (synthetic Vitamin B) and Tocopherols (synthetic Vitamin E) included in
9 each of the Nutrition Bars cannot be labeled "natural." ¶ 42, Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 (labels); Kravec
10 Decl. Exhibit 12 (ZonePerfect's Supplemental Response to Interrogatory No. 2) at 6-10 (

11 [REDACTED]); 62 Fed.
12 Reg. 49826, 49841 (Sept. 23, 1997) ("the term 'natural' should not be used when referring to a vitamin
13 that is only obtained through chemical synthesis."); Kravec Decl. Exhibit 13 (

14 [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]); *see also Larsen v. Trader Joe's Co.*, --- F.Supp.2d ----,
16 2013 WL 132442, *4 (N.D.Cal. 2013)(Illston, D.J.)(holding FDA regulations do not permit the labeling
17 of non-natural vitamins as "natural," even if the natural and synthetic vitamins are chemically identical
18 because "there is some value to consumers and the market of knowing whether ingredients are synthetic
19 or naturally occurring"). Consumers care whether a product contains natural or artificial vitamins
20 because synthetic, crystalline chemical vitamins used in processed foods are different from, and have
21 different properties then, vitamins found in nature. Kravec Decl. Exhibit 14 (Thiel RJ, "The truth about
22 vitamins in supplements," ANMA Monitor. 2003;6(2):6-14").

23 [REDACTED]
24 [REDACTED] Kravec Decl. Exhibit 11, deposition of
25 ZonePerfect through Dr. Robert Joseph pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 30(b)(6) ("Joseph Dep.") at 20:14-25.
26 While ZonePerfect does not publicly define the term "natural", [REDACTED]

27
28 § 184.1890 (Tocopherols).

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED] Joseph Dep. at 18:5-13 ([REDACTED]
 5 [REDACTED]).⁸ The fact that ZonePerfect
 6 maintains an internal definition of “natural” and employs it in the formulation of their products
 7 demonstrates commonality under Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(2) and 23(b)(3). Moreover, the fact that that
 8 ZonePerfect maintains an internal definition of “natural” does not mean its definition is correct or
 9 would be consistent with what a reasonable consumer would understand the term “natural” to mean.
 10 See *infra* at §II.D. Indeed, ZonePerfect’s definition of “natural” is inconsistent with the guidance
 11 provided by the Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) – the body governing label representations at
 12 issue in this litigation. While the FDA does not specifically regulate the use of the terms “natural,” the
 13 agency does provide clear guidance for industry by stating that it does not “object[] to the use of the
 14 term [“natural”] if the food does not contain added color, artificial flavors, or synthetic substances.”
 15 Kravec Decl. Exhibit 2 at 45. Moreover, with respect to vitamins, FDA regulation prohibits food
 16 products containing synthetic vitamins from being called “natural.” 62 Fed. Reg. 49826, 49841 (Sept.
 17 23, 1997) (“the term ‘natural’ should not be used when referring to a vitamin that is only obtained
 18 through chemical synthesis.”).

19 Notwithstanding its ill-conceived notion of “natural,” it is notable that ZonePerfect violated its
 20 own internal definition as each of the Nutrition Bars contained a chemical preservative. See ¶ 42 and
 21 Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2 at 74 (showing each Nutrition Bar contains Ascorbic Acid); 21
 22 C.F.R. 182.3013 (Ascorbic Acid is a “Chemical Preservative”); Kravec Decl. Exhibit 15 (Jan. 7, 2000
 23 Warning Letter to Fruit Fillings, Inc. citing the company for failing to call out the presence of a
 24 chemical preservative, e.g., Ascorbic Acid); Kravec Decl. Exhibit 3 ([REDACTED]
 25 [REDACTED]); Kravec

26 _____
 27 ⁸ The FDA has also adopted an informal policy that a product is *not* natural if it contains artificial or
 28 synthetic substances, *see* ¶ 15, but the FDA’s policy does not bind this Court. *See Holk v. Snapple Beverage Corp.*, 575 F.3d 329, 342 (3d Cir. 2009) (holding FDA policy lacks “the force of law”).

1 Decl. Exhibit 10 ([REDACTED]
2 [REDACTED]
3 [REDACTED])⁹4 **D. Common Evidence Shows that ZonePerfect’s “All-Natural” Claim Is
5 Material To Purchasers’ Decision to Buy Nutrition Bars**6 Common evidence produced to date from ZonePerfect’s records is more than sufficient to prove
7 its “All-Natural” claim is material. Documentary evidence, including ZonePerfect’s own marketing
8 studies, establishes that claims such as “All-Natural” are material to ZonePerfect consumers and
9 significantly affect purchase intent. [REDACTED]
10 [REDACTED]
11 [REDACTED]. Kravec Decl.12 Exhibit 16 at 10, 13 and 25 – 27. *See also* Kravec Decl. Exhibit 17 at 3 ([REDACTED]
13 [REDACTED]
14 [REDACTED]). [REDACTED]
15 [REDACTED]” Kravec Decl. Exhibit 25 at 22. [REDACTED]
16 [REDACTED] Kravec Decl. Exhibit 18 at 19. [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED]
18 [REDACTED] Kravec Decl. Exhibit 33
19 at 3.20 ZonePerfect’s internal studies are consistent with common evidence that consumers generally
21 are motivated by “all natural” claims. Commercial marketing studies are similarly replete with
22 evidence of the materiality of “All Natural” claims to purchasers. A 2010 Mintel study reported that
23 75% of 25-34 year-olds, 74% of 18-24 year-olds, and 55% of 55-64 year-olds, are either very or
24 somewhat interested in consuming all natural foods, that more than 6 in 10 users of natural/organic
25 products “agree that it’s worth paying more for natural products,” and that “demand for all-natural26
27 ⁹ Notwithstanding violating its own definition of natural, the Nutrition Bars at issue were each labeled
28 “All-Natural” – a broader, more definite statement than simply calling a product “natural” – and one
which makes the misrepresentation even more egregious ¶ 14.

1 products is high among young adults and will remain relatively strong in years to come, as these young
 2 people mature, start families, and gain greater influence.” Kravec Decl. Exhibit 19 at 52. Indeed, sales
 3 of food products with “natural” claims exceed \$20 billion dollars annually. Kravec Dec. Exhibit 27 at
 4 3.

5 Numerous studies further show the materiality of “natural” label claims throughout the class
 6 period. In 2008, market research group Packaged Facts reported “[t]he overall trend is clear...[n]atural
 7 and organic products are flying high in segments that are otherwise flat.” Kravec Decl. Exhibit 32 at 3-
 8 5. The same study attributed the success of Clif Bar, the dominant nutrition bar manufacturer, in part to
 9 Clif’s offering nutrition bars with “all natural ingredients.” *Id.* at 75. By 2009, “Natural” had become
 10 the most popular claim when launching new foods and beverages in the United States. Kravec Decl.
 11 Exhibit 28 at 2. A 2009 study reported 50% of consumers rated a “Natural” claim on a food package as
 12 either “Very Important” or “Important.” Kravec Decl. Exhibit 33 at 5. In fact, as a 2011 study reports,
 13 25% of consumers rated “100 percent natural” or “all natural” as “the best description to read on a food
 14 label.” Kravec. Decl. Exhibit 31. U.S. retail sales of natural and organic food and beverages are
 15 expected to double from \$39 billion in 2010 to \$78 billion in 2015. Kravec. Dec. Exhibit 2 at 68. This
 16 follows a five-year sales increase of 63% from 2005 through 2010. *Id.*

17 Common evidence from ZonePerfect and independent commercial market researchers shows
 18 that marketing a product “All Natural” is material to consumers.

19 **E. Additional Common Evidence Corroborates The Materiality of
 20 ZonePerfect’s “All-Natural” Claims**

21 Research shows consumers rely on front-of-package label statements to form impressions about
 22 and make decisions about food products. Kravec Decl. Exhibit 29 at 9-10 (“Three of seven studies
 23 reviewed found that consumers could more easily identify the healthier of two products using all FOP
 24 [front-of-package] labels studied compared with the no-label condition...FOP labels increase
 25 consumers’ ability to correctly identify a healthier product compared with the no-label condition...for
 26 all product categories studied[.]”). According to a 2010 FDA survey, 67% of consumers rely on front-
 27 of-package information “often” or “sometimes” when making purchasing decisions. Kravec Decl.
 28 Exhibit 31. Labels serve as a useful information tool for consumers in evaluating product attributes.

1 Kravec Decl. Exhibit 2 at 42. **Simply stated: labels matter.** The marketing industry is based on the
 2 premise that labels matter, that consumers will choose one product over another similar product based
 3 on its label...”)(emphasis added). *Kwikset Corp. v. Sup. Ct.*, 51 Cal.4th 310, 328 (Cal. 2011).

4 **F. ZonePerfect’s Nutrition Bars Are A Single Product Line**

5 Although Plaintiff has not purchased each and every flavor of ZonePerfect’s Nutrition Bars, her
 6 purchase is sufficiently similar to those of all other members of the Class since ZonePerfect’s Nutrition
 7 Bars are a single product line.

8 As this Court has already concluded:

9 [T]here is more than enough similarity between the Chocolate Peanut Butter Bars allegedly
 10 purchased and the other nineteen varieties of nutrition bars identified in the Complaint. The
 11 accused products are all of a single kind, that is, they are all nutrition bars. They share a
 12 uniform size and shape. On casual inspection, the only obvious difference between the bars is
 13 their flavor. Closer inspection reveals some difference between the ingredients used in
 14 different flavors, but the similarities are more striking: six of the nine challenged ingredients
 15 appear in all twenty nutrition bar flavors. *See Compl. ¶ 42.* Most importantly, all twenty
 16 flavors bear the same challenged label: “All-Natural Nutrition Bars.” The Court concludes
 17 that Ms. Sethavanish has standing for both Article III and UCL purposes to sue for alleged
 18 mislabeling of all twenty nutrition bar flavors identified in the Complaint.

19 Dkt No. 38 at p. 9. This is consistent with ZonePerfect’s corporate representative, who testified that,

20 [REDACTED]
 21 [REDACTED]” Casey Dep at 27:25 – 28:2.

22 It is also generally well accepted that a plaintiff may represent a class consisting of individuals
 23 who have purchased products in the same product line as the particular product he or she purchased.¹⁰
 24 *See e.g., Beck-Ellman*, 283 F.R.D. at 571 (certifying claims on class of purchasers of “electric heating
 25 pads bearing the words ‘Kaz’ and/or ‘SoftHeat’ and/or ‘Smart/Heat’ and/or ‘Dunlap’ and/or the number
 26 1-800-477-0457”); *Chavez*, 268 F.R.D. at 380 (certifying claims of a class of purchasers of “any
 27 beverage bearing the Blue Sky mark or brand”); *Astiana v. Dreyers Grand Ice Cream, Inc.*, No. C-11-
 28 2910 EMC, 2012 WL 2990766, *11 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2012) (different flavors of ice cream); *Koh v.*

29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000
 1001
 1002
 1003
 1004
 1005
 1006
 1007
 1008
 1009
 1010
 1011
 1012
 1013
 1014
 1015
 1016
 1017
 1018
 1019
 1020
 1021
 1022
 1023
 1024
 1025
 1026
 1027
 1028
 1029
 1030
 1031
 1032
 1033
 1034
 1035
 1036
 1037
 1038
 1039
 1040
 1041
 1042
 1043
 1044
 1045
 1046
 1047
 1048
 1049
 1050
 1051
 1052
 1053
 1054
 1055
 1056
 1057
 1058
 1059
 1060
 1061
 1062
 1063
 1064
 1065
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069
 1070
 1071
 1072
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076
 1077
 1078
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082
 1083
 1084
 1085
 1086
 1087
 1088
 1089
 1090
 1091
 1092
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096
 1097
 1098
 1099
 1100
 1101
 1102
 1103
 1104
 1105
 1106
 1107
 1108
 1109
 1110
 1111
 1112
 1113
 1114
 1115
 1116
 1117
 1118
 1119
 1120
 1121
 1122
 1123
 1124
 1125
 1126
 1127
 1128
 1129
 1130
 1131
 1132
 1133
 1134
 1135
 1136
 1137
 1138
 1139
 1140
 1141
 1142
 1143
 1144
 1145
 1146
 1147
 1148
 1149
 1150
 1151
 1152
 1153
 1154
 1155
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159
 1160
 1161
 1162
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167
 1168
 1169
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173
 1174
 1175
 1176
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180
 1181
 1182
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186
 1187
 1188
 1189
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193
 1194
 1195
 1196
 1197
 1198
 1199
 1200
 1201
 1202
 1203
 1204
 1205
 1206
 1207
 1208
 1209
 1210
 1211
 1212
 1213
 1214
 1215
 1216
 1217
 1218
 1219
 1220
 1221
 1222
 1223
 1224
 1225
 1226
 1227
 1228
 1229
 1230
 1231
 1232
 1233
 1234
 1235
 1236
 1237
 1238
 1239
 1240
 1241
 1242
 1243
 1244
 1245
 1246
 1247
 1248
 1249
 1250
 1251
 1252
 1253
 1254
 1255
 1256
 1257
 1258
 1259
 1260
 1261
 1262
 1263
 1264
 1265
 1266
 1267
 1268
 1269
 1270
 1271
 1272
 1273
 1274
 1275
 1276
 1277
 1278
 1279
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288
 1289
 1290
 1291
 1292
 1293
 1294
 1295
 1296
 1297
 1298
 1299
 1300
 1301
 1302
 1303
 1304
 1305
 1306
 1307
 1308
 1309
 1310
 1311
 1312
 1313
 1314
 1315
 1316
 1317
 1318
 1319
 1320
 1321
 1322
 1323
 1324
 1325
 1326
 1327
 1328
 1329
 1330
 1331
 1332
 1333
 1334
 1335
 1336
 1337
 1338
 1339
 1340
 1341
 1342
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346
 1347
 1348
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352
 1353
 1354
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358
 1359
 1360
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364
 1365
 1366
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370
 1371
 1372
 1373
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377
 1378
 1379
 1380
 1381
 1382
 1383
 1384
 1385
 1386
 1387
 1388
 1389
 1390
 1391
 1392
 1393
 1394
 1395
 1396
 1397
 1398
 1399
 1400
 1401
 1402
 1403
 1404
 1405
 1406
 1407
 1408
 1409
 1410
 1411
 1412
 1413
 1414
 1415
 1416
 1417
 1418
 1419
 1420
 1421
 1422
 1423
 1424
 1425
 1426
 1427
 1428
 1429
 1430
 1431
 1432
 1433
 1434
 1435
 1436
 1437
 1438
 1439
 1440
 1441<br

1 *S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc.*, No. C-09-00927 RMW, 2010 WL 94265, *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2010),
 2 (different types of detergents).

3 As recently explained by Judge Chen, in refusing to dismiss class allegations:

4 Plaintiffs are challenging the same kind of food products (i.e., ice cream) as well as the same
 5 labels for all of the products— i.e., “All Natural Flavors” for the Dreyer’s/Edy’s products and
 6 “All Natural Ice Cream” for the Haagen-Dazs products. That the different ice creams may
 7 ultimately have different ingredients is not dispositive as Plaintiffs are challenging the same
 basic mislabeling practice across different product flavors. Indeed, many of the ingredients
 are the same... Therefore, the Court rejects [Defendant’s] argument that claims based on ice
 cream products not purchased by Plaintiffs should be dismissed from the case.

8 *Astiana*, 2012 WL 2990766, *13.

9 This same logic applies to the Nutrition Bars at issue here which come in different flavors, *see ¶*
 10 42; Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 (Labels), but which bear identical “All-Natural” labeling claims and share
 11 many of the same non-natural ingredients. *See also ¶ 42* (showing the labels and listing the unnatural
 12 ingredients); Dkt. No. 38 at 9 (“The accused products are all of a single kind, that is, they are all
 13 nutrition bars. They share a uniform size and shape. On casual inspection, the only obvious difference
 14 between the bars is their flavor. Closer inspection reveals some difference between the ingredients used
 15 in different flavors, but the similarities are more striking: six of the nine challenged ingredients appear
 16 in all twenty nutrition bar flavors”). Accordingly, Plaintiff’s claims are sufficiently similar to those of
 17 all other members of the Class to support certification.

18 **G. Class-wide Relief Can Be Proved on a Common Basis**

19 Plaintiff is able to prove entitlement to relief on a common basis for the Class.

20 Plaintiff can establish restitution (from data of average retail prices, numbers of units sold),
 21 restitutionary disgorgement of profits (from data on ZonePerfect’s sales and costs), and damages based on
 22 a price-premium theory (from data of average retail prices) on a common basis for the Class.
 23 ZonePerfect keeps the necessary records on sales, profits, and costs for the ZonePerfect Nutrition Bars,
 24 from which Plaintiff will be able to prove this restitution and damages nationwide. *See, e.g.*, Casey
 25 Dep. at 62:2 – 63:6 [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED] 70:13-17, 132:11-15, 137:11-15 [REDACTED]

27 [REDACTED] . [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED] *Id.* at 70:13-17 ([REDACTED]

2 [REDACTED]); Kravec Decl. Exhibit 20 [REDACTED]

3 [REDACTED] Further, if necessary, Plaintiff
4 can calculate this restitution and damages on a statewide basis, based upon a combination of
5 ZonePerfect's records, records subpoenaed from ZonePerfect's distributors, wholesalers and/or
6 retailers, and records maintained by third-party retail information collector such as Nielsen.7 **III. THIS COURT CAN CERTIFY A NATIONWIDE CLASS AS ZONEPERFECT'S
CONDUCT EMANATES FROM CALIFORNIA**8
9 This Court may certify a nationwide class because ZonePerfect's conduct emanates from
10 California.¹¹ *Mazza v. Am. Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, 666 F.3d 581, 589-590 (9th Cir. 2012).11 [REDACTED] Casey Dep. at 15:18
12 – 16:16 ([REDACTED]

13 [REDACTED]). [REDACTED]

14 [REDACTED]. *Id.*,
15 17:19 – 20:9. Where, as here, the conduct underlying Plaintiff's claims substantially emanates from
16 California, this Court may apply California law nationwide, as other recent cases have done since
17 *Mazza*. See, e.g., *In re Pom Wonderful*, 2012 WL 4490860 at *3-4; *Bruno v. Eckart Corp.*, 280 F.R.D.
18 540, 543 (C.D. Cal. 2012).19 **IV. THE REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION PURSUANT TO FED.R.CIV.P. 23(a)
20 AND 23(b)(3) ARE MET**21 **A. Standard**22 “The class action is ‘an exception to the usual rule that litigation is conducted by and on behalf
23 of the individual named parties only.’” *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*, 131 S.Ct. 2541, 2550 (2011).
24 To qualify, the party seeking class certification must provide facts sufficient to satisfy the requirements25
26

¹¹ A federal court sitting in diversity must apply the choice-of-law rules of the forum state. *Klaxon Co.*
27 *v. Stentor Elec. Mfg. Co.*, 313 U.S. 487, 496 (1941). Under California's choice-of-law rules, if this due
28 process test is satisfied, the presumption is that California law applies; the burden of proving otherwise
rests with the party seeking to invoke foreign law. *Washington Mutual Bank v. Superior Court*, 24
Cal.4th 906, 103 Cal.Rptr.2d 320, 15 P.3d 1071, 1080 (Cal 2001).

1 of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b). *Zinser v. Accufix Research Inst., Inc.*, 253 F.3d 1180,
 2 1186 (9th Cir.2001). Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) requires Plaintiff to demonstrate: (1) numerosity; (2)
 3 commonality of the factual and legal issues; (3) typicality of Plaintiff's claims and defenses to those of
 4 the class; and (4) adequacy of Plaintiff and her counsel. Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(b)(3) requires that the
 5 questions of law or fact common to class members predominate over any questions affecting only
 6 individual members, and that a class action is superior to other available methods for fairly and
 7 efficiently adjudicating the controversy.

8 The district court must conduct a rigorous analysis to determine whether Rule 23 has been
 9 satisfied. *Gen. Tel. Co. v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 161 (1982). It is a well-recognized precept that “the
 10 class determination generally involves considerations that are ‘enmeshed in the factual and legal issues
 11 comprising the plaintiff's cause of action,’” *Coopers & Lybrand v. Livesay*, 437 U.S. 463, 469 (1978)
 12 (quotation citation omitted), and a court must consider the merits if they overlap with the Rule 23
 13 requirements. *Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp.*, 657 F.3d 970, 981 (9th Cir.2011). However, “it is
 14 improper to advance a decision on the merits at the class certification stage,” *Moore v. Hughes
 15 Helicopters, Inc.*, 708 F.2d 475, 480 (9th Cir.1983) (citation omitted); *see Eisen v. Carlisle &
 16 Jacqueline*, 417 U.S. 156, 178 (1974), and a court's review of the merits should be limited to those
 17 aspects relevant to making the certification decision on an informed basis. Fed.R.Civ.P. 23 advisory
 18 notes.

19 **B. Rule 23(a)(1) – Numerosity**

20 Rule 23(a)(1) requires the class to be “so numerous that joinder of all members is
 21 impracticable.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(1). “Impracticability does not mean impossibility,” rather the
 22 inquiry focuses on the difficulty or inconvenience of joining all members of class. *Harris v. Palm
 23 Springs Alpine Estates, Inc.*, 329 F.2d 909, 913–914 (9th Cir.1964). As a general rule, classes of forty
 24 or more are considered sufficiently numerous.” *Ikonen v. Hartz Mountain Corp.*, 122 F.R.D. 258, 262
 25 (S.D. Cal. 1998); *Swanson v. American Consumer Indus.*, 415 F.2d 1326, 1333 (7th Cir. 1969) (40
 26 sufficient). Moreover, in determining whether numerosity is satisfied, the Court may consider
 27 reasonable inferences drawn from the facts before it. *Gay v. Waiters' & Dairy Lunchmen's Union*, 549
 28 F.2d 1330, 1332 n. 5 (9th Cir.1977).

1 Here, at minimum, the Class consists of thousands of consumers. [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED]
 3 [REDACTED]. Kravec Dec. Exhibit 21 [REDACTED]
 4 [REDACTED]).¹² ZonePerfect cannot dispute the
 5 numerosity of the proposed Class.

6 While the exact number of consumers is not currently knowable, the threshold minimum for
 7 establishing numerosity under Rule 23(a)(1) is clearly satisfied. *See, e.g., Beck-Ellman*, 283 F.R.D. at
 8 564 (inferring numerosity based upon allegation of sale of 5 million heating pads over 8-year period);
 9 *Chavez*, 268 F.R.D. at 376 (inferring numerosity based on “allegation that Blue Sky sold over \$20
 10 million of product”).

11 **C. Rule 23(a)(3) – Typicality**

12 Rule 23(a)(3) requires the representative party to have claims that are “typical of the claims or
 13 defenses of the class.” Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(3). Typicality is satisfied “when each class member’s claim
 14 arises from the same course of events, and each class member makes similar legal arguments to prove
 15 the defendants’ liability.” *Rodriguez v. Hayes*, 591 F.3d 1105, 1124 (9th Cir.2010) (citations omitted).
 16 The typicality requirement is “permissive and requires only that the representative’s claims are
 17 reasonably co-extensive with those of the absent class members; they need not be substantially
 18 identical.” *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*, 150 F.3d 1011, 1020 (9th Cir. 1998). However, “[c]lass
 19 certification is inappropriate where a putative class representative is subject to unique defenses which
 20 threaten to become the focus of the litigation.” *Hanon v. Dataproducts Corp.*, 976 F.2d 497, 508 (9th
 21 Cir.1992) (citations omitted).

22 In this case, Plaintiff’s claims are clearly typical. Plaintiff’s and all Class members’ claims each
 23 arise from the same course of events – the sales of “All-Natural” labeled Nutrition Bars which
 24 contained non-natural substances. Kravec Decl. Exhibit 22 (Plaintiff’s Answers to Defendant’s First
 25 Set of Interrogatories, Nos. 1, 4 and 5.); ¶ 1. Kravec Decl. Exhibit 23 (Excerpts of Deposition of
 26 Kimberly S. Sethavanish taken on June 20, 2013 (“Sethavanish Dep.”), at 5 – 10; 11 - 12 (confirming
 27

28 ¹² ZonePerfect maintains similar tables of its direct sales to retailers for each year of Plaintiff’s

1 purchases and reasons). Plaintiff and Class members were also each exposed to the identical alleged
 2 misrepresentations on the packages, ¶ 42, Kravec Decl. Exhibit 1 (Labels), and thus share the same
 3 interests in determining whether the ZonePerfect Products were deceptively labeled. *See, e.g., Beck-*
 4 *Ellman*, 283 F.R.D. at 565; *Johns*, 280 F.R.D. at 557.

5 In addition, it is worth emphasizing that Plaintiff's claims are typical of **both** class members'
 6 claims based upon purchases of the identical flavor of nutrition bar **and** class members' claims based
 7 upon purchases of other flavors of the Nutrition Bars. *See* Section II.F, *supra*.

8 As recognized in *Beck-Ellman*, a plaintiff who purchases products within the same product line
 9 with the same labeling omissions (or claims) is "sufficiently similar" to, and can represent, all other
 10 class members within that product line. 283 F.R.D. at 566 (certifying claims on behalf of all models in
 11 "heating pad" product line where all "heating pads contain similar omission[s]"); *see also Chavez*, 268
 12 F.R.D. at 378 (certifying claims; stating "Although plaintiff did not purchase each type of beverage
 13 carrying the misleading label, his claims are 'reasonably coextensive with those of absent members.'")
 14 (citation omitted). As in *Beck-Ellman* and *Chavez*, Plaintiff's claims cover the same product line, bear
 15 the materially identical misrepresentation and, therefore, have claims that are "sufficiently similar" to
 16 those of all other class members.

17 In sum, Plaintiff's claims arise from the same course of events, share the same legal theory, and
 18 are "reasonably coextensive" of the claims of the Class. Thus, the typicality requirement is satisfied
 19 here.

20 **D. Rule 23(a)(4) – Adequacy of Representation**

21 Rule 23(a) also requires the representative parties to "fairly and adequately protect the interests
 22 of the class." Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(4). The Ninth Circuit set a two-prong test for this requirement: "(1) do
 23 the named plaintiffs and their counsel have any conflicts of interest with other class members and (2)
 24 will the named plaintiffs and their counsel prosecute the action vigorously on behalf of the class?"
 25 *Staton v. Boeing Co.*, 327 F.3d 938, 957 (9th Cir.2003) (citing *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1020).

26
 27
 28 proposed class, showing sales to all 50 states.

1 Here, Plaintiff is an adequate representative because she is a member of the Class she seeks to
 2 represent, shares the same claims and interest in obtaining relief as all other class members, and has no
 3 conflicts of interests with other class members. *Beck-Ellman*, 283 F.R.D. at 567; *In re Ferrero*, 278
 4 F.R.D. at 559; *see Falcon*, 457 U.S. at 157-8, n. 13 (noting that where the claims of the class and class
 5 representatives are coextensive, there is no conflict). Plaintiff has also demonstrated her adequacy
 6 through her participation thus far in this litigation. *See* Kravec Decl. Exhibit 22 (Plaintiff's Interrog.
 7 Resps.); Sethavanish Dep. at 11 (Plaintiff bought the Nutrition Bars because her husband Mr. Colucci
 8 wanted "All-Natural" bars); at 16 (Plaintiff would only accept an incentive award if she agreed with the
 9 judgment).

10 In addition, proposed Class Counsel (*i.e.*, Joseph N. Kravec, Jr. of Feinstein Doyle Payne &
 11 Kravec, LLC, Michael D. Braun of the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Janet Lindner Spielberg of the Law
 12 Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg) are adequate, as they are qualified, experienced, and generally able
 13 to conduct the proposed litigation as required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(g). *See* Kravec Decl. Exs 5-7. In
 14 fact, a Court within this District has already recognized the abilities of Messer's Kravec, Braun and
 15 Spielberg in appointing them co-lead class counsel while certifying a nationwide litigation class against
 16 Diamond Foods, Inc. for the company falsely labeling packages of shelled walnuts. *See Zeisel*, 2011
 17 WL 2221113 at *9. Here, proposed Class Counsel have also demonstrated their adequacy by
 18 vigorously prosecuting this action through discovery and litigation of ZonePerfect's motion to dismiss.
 19 Dkt. No. 38 (Order denying in large part ZonePerfect's motion to dismiss); *See In re Emulex Corp.*, 210
 20 F.R.D. 717, 720 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (In evaluating the adequacy of counsel, "a court may examine the
 21 attorneys' professional qualifications, skill, experience, and resources. The court may also look at the
 22 attorneys' demonstrated performance in the suit itself") (citations omitted).

23 Respectfully, Plaintiff and proposed Class Counsel are adequate.

24 **E. Rule 23(a)(2) Commonality / Rule 23(b)(3) Predominance¹³**

25 "Commonality requires the plaintiff to demonstrate that the class members 'have suffered the
 26 same injury.'" *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 131 S.Ct. at 2551. This requires that the "claims must depend on
 27

28

¹³ Post *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, the commonality and predominance requirements have effectively

1 a common contention" that is "capable of classwide resolution—which means that determination of its
 2 truth or falsity will resolve an issue that is central to the validity of each one of the claims in one
 3 stroke." *Id.* Commonality is satisfied by "existence of shared legal issues with divergent factual
 4 predicates" or a "common core of salient facts coupled with disparate legal remedies within the class."
 5 *Hanlon*, 150 F.3d at 1019–20. All questions of fact and law need not be common to satisfy the rule.
 6 *Rodriguez*, 591 F.3d at 1122.

7 To satisfy predominance, it is not enough to establish that common questions of law or fact
 8 exist. "Rule 23(b)(3) focuses on the relationship between the common and individual issues." *Hanlon*,
 9 150 F.3d at 1022. Class certification under Rule 23(b)(3) is proper when common questions present a
 10 significant portion of the case and can be resolved for all class members in a single adjudication. *Id.*
 11 The predominance test is more rigorous as it "tests whether proposed classes are sufficiently cohesive
 12 to warrant adjudication by representation." *Amchem Products, Inc. v. Windsor*, 521 U.S. 591, 623–624
 13 (1997). Despite the enhanced rigor, the Supreme Court noted "[p]redominance is a test readily met in
 14 certain cases alleging consumer...fraud." *Id.* at 625.

15 1. Common Questions Exist for Plaintiff and the Class

16 The commonality element is easily satisfied for Plaintiff and the Class.

17 Here, Plaintiff's and all Class members' claims each arise from ZonePerfect's identical
 18 misrepresentations that the Nutrition Bars were "All-Natural" when, in fact, these products contained
 19 non-natural ingredients, and Plaintiff's and Class members' claims depend on common factual and
 20 legal contentions the determination of which will resolve issues that are central to the validity of their
 21 claims in a single stroke. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 131 S.Ct. at 2551. Such common questions include:
 22 (1) whether ZonePerfect labeled the Nutrition Bars "All-Natural"; (2) whether the Nutrition Bars that
 23 include non-natural synthetic substances are "All-Natural"; (3) whether ZonePerfect's "All-Natural"
 24 labeling is and was likely to deceive class members or the general public; (4) whether ZonePerfect's
 25 "All-Natural" representations are unlawful; and (5) the appropriate measure of damages, restitution
 26 and/or restitutionary disgorgement. ¶ 55 a, c, d, e, f.

27
 28 merged, so Plaintiff addresses them together.

1 These common contentions satisfy Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(a)(2) and, as discussed below, predominate
 2 over any individual issues, as recent certifications of similar labeling misrepresentation claims by this
 3 Court and other district courts confirm.¹⁴

4 **2. Common Questions of Law Predominate As To Plaintiff's Consumer
 5 Protection Claims**

6 Plaintiff asserts causes of action under the UCL¹⁵, the FAL, and the CLRA on behalf of herself
 7 and the Class. ¶¶ 80-113. Each of Plaintiff's statutory causes of action lends itself to proof by common
 8 inquiry and therefore satisfies the predominance requirement set forth by Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(b)(3).

9 Plaintiff asserts claims on her own behalf and on behalf of the Class under the "unlawful" prong
 10 of the UCL. ¶¶ 80-87. Unlawful business acts include "any practices forbidden by law." *South Bay*, 72
 11 Cal. App. 4th at 880. As discussed above, Plaintiff will be able to establish through common evidence
 12 that ZonePerfect's "All-Natural" claims are false and misleading to consumers. *See Sections II.A-E,*
 13 *supra*. Since federal and state law identically prohibit false and misleading labeling of food, 21 U.S.C.
 14 § 343(a)(1); Cal. Health & Safety Code §§ 110660, 110100(a), ZonePerfect's false and misleading
 15 labeling gives rise to UCL unlawful claims on behalf of the Class. *South Bay*, 72 Cal. App. 4th at 880
 16 ("section 17200 'borrows' violations of other laws and treats them as unlawful practices independently
 17 actionable under section 17200 et seq."). Notably, the proof needed to establish these violations is not
 18 based on any individualized factor and is common across the Class.

19 Plaintiff asserts claims on her own behalf and on behalf of the Class under the "unfair" prong of
 20 the UCL. ¶¶ 88-92. Under this prong, the Court must examine the impact of ZonePerfect's practice
 21 "on its alleged victims, balanced against the reasons, justifications and motives of the alleged
 22 wrongdoer. In brief, the court must weigh the utility of the defendant's conduct against the gravity of
 23 the harm to the alleged victim...." *Motors, Inc. v. Times Mirror Co.*, 102 Cal. App. 3d 735, 740 (Cal.

24 ¹⁴ *See, e.g., In re Pom Wonderful*, 2012 WL 4490860, *1 (certifying labeling claims); *Johns*, 280 F.R.D.
 25 at 559 (same); *In re Ferrero*, 278 F.R.D. at 556 (same); *Johnson*, 276 F.R.D. at 521 (C.D.Cal.2011)
 26 (re-affirming certification); *Zeisel*, 2011 WL 2221113, *1 (certifying labeling claims); *Chavez*, 268
 F.R.D. at 380 (same).

27 ¹⁵ Plaintiff asserts claims under the "unlawful," "unfair," and "fraudulent" prongs of the UCL. ¶¶ 80-
 28 98. Each prong of the UCL is a separate theory of liability which offers an independent basis for relief.
South Bay Chevrolet v. Gen. Motors Acceptance Corp., 72 Cal. App. 4th 861, 878 (Cal. Ct. App. 1999).

1 Ct. App. 1980); *Gafcon, Inc. v. Ponsor & Assocs.*, 98 Cal. App. 4th 1388, 1425 n. 15 (Cal. Ct. App.
 2 2002) (same). Here again, this is an inquiry that is common to all members of the Class. ZonePerfect's
 3 motivation – increased sales and market share – is not unique to Plaintiff or any Class member.
 4 Similarly, the harm to Plaintiff resulting from the purchase of the Nutrition Bars is no different than the
 5 harm to any of those she seeks to represent.

6 Plaintiff also asserts claims on her own behalf and on behalf of the Class under the "fraudulent"
 7 prong of the UCL and the FAL. ¶¶ 93-105. For this claim, Plaintiff must demonstrate her individual
 8 reliance on ZonePerfect's "All-Natural" statement resulted in injury in fact, *In re Tobacco II Cases*, 46
 9 Cal.4th 298, 325-27 (Cal. 2009), and show that "members of the public are likely to be deceived" by
 10 ZonePerfect's misrepresentations. *Williams v. Gerber Prods.*, 552 F.3d 934, 938 (9th Cir. 2008). For
 11 class members, however, relief "is available without individualized proof of deception, reliance and
 12 injury." *Stearns v. Ticketmaster Corp.*, 655 F.3d 1013, 1020 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing *Tobacco II*, 46 Cal
 13 4th at 320). Plaintiff can prove individual injury and reliance, *see* ¶ 8; Kravec Decl. Exhibit 23
 14 (Sethavanish Dep. at 12-13), and all other elements may be proved on a common basis.

15 Finally, Plaintiff asserts claims on her own behalf and on behalf of the Class under the CLRA,
 16 ¶¶ 106-113, which are likewise subject to proof by common evidence. The CLRA makes it unlawful to
 17 1) represent that the goods (i.e., the Nutrition Bars) had characteristics which they do not have (i.e., all
 18 natural ingredients) (Cal.Civ.Code § 1770(a)(5)); 2) represent that goods are a particular standard,
 19 quality or grade which they are not (Cal.Civ.Code § 1770(a)(7)); and 3) advertise goods with the intent
 20 not to sell them as advertised (Cal.Civ.Code § 1770(a)(9)). For the same reasons as above, the proof of
 21 whether ZonePerfect's Nutrition Bars were represented to be "All-Natural," or were "All-Natural"
 22 when they were not, or that ZonePerfect advertised the Nutrition Bars as being "All-Natural" with the
 23 intent not to sell "All-Natural" bars will be common to the Class. Moreover, while reliance is an
 24 element of a CLRA claim, it may be inferred as to the entire class if the representations were
 25 objectively material. *In re Steroid Hormone Prod. Cases*, 181 Cal.App.4th 145, 157 (Cal. Ct. App.
 26 2010); *Mass. Mut. Life Ins. Co v. Sup. Ct.*, 97 Cal. App. 4th 1282, 1292 (Cal. Ct. App. 2002). The
 27 record is replete with evidence of the materiality of these statements, which ZonePerfect plastered on
 28

1 every package of the ZonePerfect Products sold to class members. *See* Section II.D; Kravec Decl.
 2 Exhibit 1; *Kwikset*, 51 Cal.4th at 332-333 (defining materiality).

3 **3. Common Questions of Law Predominate As To Plaintiff's Common Law
 4 Fraud and Quasi Contract Claims**

5 Plaintiff asserts causes of action for fraud and restitution based on quasi-contract on behalf of
 6 themselves and the Class. ¶¶ 71-79, 114-116. Like Plaintiff's consumer protection claims, common
 7 questions of law predominate on these claims, satisfying Rule 23(b)(3).

8 Plaintiff brings claims for common law fraud, which requires proof of (1) misrepresentation of a
 9 material fact (consisting of false representation, concealment or nondisclosure); (2) knowledge of
 10 falsity (scienter); (3) intent to deceive and induce reliance; (4) justifiable reliance on the
 11 misrepresentation; and (5) resulting damage. *City of Atascadero v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner &*
 12 *Smith, Inc.*, 68 Cal. App. 4th 445, 481, 80 Cal. Rptr. 2d 329, 354 (1998)(citing Civ.Code, §§ 1572,
 13 1709-1710)(further citations omitted). As above, these elements can be proved from common evidence
 14 that 1) ZonePerfect misrepresented that the Nutrition Bars were "All-Natural;" 2) that the "All-Natural"
 15 statement is material to the average consumer; 3) that ZonePerfect knew that the bars were not "All-
 16 Natural;" 4) that ZonePerfect intended to deceive consumers about the nature of its ingredients; 5) that
 17 Plaintiff justifiably relied on ZonePerfect's "All-Natural" misrepresentation; and 6) that Plaintiff and
 18 class members were damaged by buying a product that was not "All-Natural." Further, no individual
 19 inquiry of absent class members is necessary since the Court can "find an inference or rebuttable
 20 presumption of reliance by each class member without his direct testimony." *Vasquez v. Superior*
 21 *Court*, 4 Cal. 3d 800, 814, 484 P.2d 964, 973 (1971); *Chavez*; 268 F.R.D. at 376 (certifying a
 22 nationwide litigation class for common law fraud and other claims where defendant mislabeled a food
 23 product's source of origin).

24 Finally, Plaintiff brings claims in the alternative for restitution based on quasi-contract, which
 25 may be proved by evidence of receipt and unjust retention of a benefit at the expense of another. *See*
 26 Dkt. 38 at 22 (sustaining Plaintiff's quasi-contract claim); *see also McKell v. Washington Mut., Inc.*,
 27 142 Cal. App. 4th 1457, 1490 (2006)(“unjust enrichment is a basis for obtaining restitution based on

1 quasi-contract"). This claim focuses on ZonePerfect's conduct and may also be proved by common
 2 evidence. *See Sections II.A-G, supra.*

3 **4. Individual Issues of Damages Do Not Predominate**

4 The determination of relief does not usually defeat predominance, and it does not do so here, as
 5 damages are capable of measurement on a class basis from ZonePerfect's records of sales, profits, and
 6 prices. *See Section II.G; Johns*, 280 F.R.D. at 559 ("amount of damages...does not defeat class action
 7 certification") (citing *Blackie v. Barrack*, 524 F.2d 891, 905 (9th Cir. 1975)); *Guido v. L'Oreal, USA,*
 8 *Inc.*, 284 F.R.D. 468, 479 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (finding price premium damages susceptible of class-wide
 9 treatment); *Cf. Comcast v. Behrend*, --- S.Ct. ----, 2013 WL 1222646, *5 (2013) (finding individual
 10 questions predominated where plaintiffs could not show anti-trust injury was capable of measurement).

11 In sum, questions capable of determination on a class basis predominate and will drive
 12 resolution of Plaintiff's and all class members' claims in this action.

13 **F. Rule 23(b)(3) – Superiority**

14 Rule 23(b)(3) also requires that the Court determine whether "a class action is superior to other
 15 available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of the controversy," based upon the following
 16 nonexclusive factors:

17 (A) the interest of members of the class in individually controlling the
 18 prosecution... of separate actions; (B) the extent and nature of any
 19 litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by... members
 20 of the class; (C) the desirability... of concentrating the litigation of the
 claims in the particular forum; (D) the difficulties likely to be
 encountered in the management of a class action.

21 Fed.R.Civ.P. 23(b)(3). These factors reflect the appropriateness of class certification here.

22 **1. Rule 23(b)(3)(A)**

23 The first factor (the interest of each class member in controlling the prosecution of separate
 24 actions) supports the superiority of a class action in the underlying matter. In a case with tens of
 25 thousands of class members (or more), each class member's interest in aggregating claims into a single
 26 class action lawsuit substantially outweighs the interest of any class member in individual control of the
 27 litigation. *See, e.g., Carnegie v. Household Int'l, Inc.*, 376 F.3d 656, 661 (7th Cir. 2004) ("The more
 28 claimants there are, the more likely a class action is to yield substantial economies in litigation").

1 Further, class members' individual claims here will be relatively small, making individual litigation
 2 impracticable. *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*, 472 U.S. 797, 809 (1985) ("most of the plaintiffs
 3 would have no realistic day in court if a class action were not available."); *In re Worldcom Inc. Sec.
 4 Litig.*, 219 F.R.D. 267, 304 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) ("Few individuals could even contemplate proceeding with
 5 this litigation in any context other than through their participation in a class action, given the expense
 6 and burden that such litigation would entail").

7 **2. Rule 23(b)(3)(B)**

8 Plaintiff's counsel are not aware of any pending litigation in which the claims at issue in this
 9 case are being separately pursued by any individual putative class members. Thus, the second factor
 10 (the extent and nature of any litigation concerning the controversy already commenced by members of
 11 the class) also supports a finding of superiority. *West v. Circle K Stores, Inc.*, 2006 WL 1652598, at *8
 12 (E.D. Cal. June 12, 2006) ("In the absence of competing lawsuits, it is also unlikely that other
 13 individuals have an interest in controlling the prosecution of this action. . .").

14 **3. Rule 23(b)(3)(C)**

15 Analysis of the desirability of concentrating the litigation of the claims in the particular forum
 16 also confirms that class treatment is a superior means of adjudicating these claims. Specifically, since
 17 ZonePerfect's conduct at issue in this litigation emanates from California, *see* Section III, *supra*,
 18 concentration of litigation in this forum is appropriate.

19 **4. Rule 23(b)(3)(D)**

20 Analysis of the fourth factor (difficulties likely to be found in the management of a class action)
 21 further confirms the superiority of the class mechanism here.

22 Quite simply, there is no reason to believe that the prosecution of the claims of the putative class
 23 members in a single class action will create more management problems than the alternative (*i.e.*, the
 24 prosecution of tens-of-thousands of separate lawsuits by individual class members). *See* Sections II.A-
 25 G (showing common proof). In fact, it would be more burdensome on the courts, parties and judicial
 26 system to entertain a multiplicity of lawsuits regarding ZonePerfect's common conduct and, in the
 27 absence of a class action, thousands of consumers would also have no reasonable means of enforcing
 28 their rights. *Carnegie*, 376 F.3d at 661 ("a class action has to be unwieldy indeed before it can be
 pronounced an inferior alternative. . . to no litigation at all."); *Haynes v. Logan Furniture Mart, Inc.*,

1 503 F.2d 1161, 1165 (7th Cir. 1974) (in deciding the “best” method, court may consider “inability of
 2 the poor or uninformed to enforce their rights, and the improbability that large numbers of class
 3 members would possess the initiative to litigate individually.”); *Jordan v. Paul Financial, LLC*, 285
 4 F.R.D. 435, 467 (N.D.Cal. 2012) (noting failure to certify due to unmanageability is disfavored).

5 Accordingly, prosecuting the case at bar as a class action does not present any difficulties within
 6 the meaning of Rule 23(b)(3)(D), and the class mechanism is clearly the superior vehicle by which to
 7 adjudicate this controversy.

8 **V. CONCLUSION**

9 For the reasons discussed herein, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court certify this case as a
 10 class action, appoint her as Class Representative, and appoint Class Counsel (*i.e.*, Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.
 11 of Feinstein Doyle Payne & Kravec, LLC, Michael D. Braun of the Braun Law Group, P.C., and Janet
 12 Lindner Spielberg of the Law Offices of Janet Lindner Spielberg), as indicated in the attached proposed
 13 order.

14 DATED: July 2, 2013

**FEINSTEIN DOYLE PAYNE
& KRAVEC, LLC**

16 By: s/Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.
 17 Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.
 18 (admitted *pro hac vice*)

19 Wyatt A. Lison (*pro hac vice*)
 20 429 Forbes Avenue, 17th Floor
 21 Pittsburgh, PA 15219
 22 Tel: (412) 281-8400
 23 Fax: (412) 281-1007
 24 Email: jkravec@stemberfeinstein.com
 25 wlison@stemberfeinstein.com

26 Michael D. Braun (Bar No. 167416)
 27 **BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.**
 28 10680 W. Pico Blvd., Suite 280
 Los Angeles, CA 90064
 Phone: (310) 836-6000
 Fax: (310) 836-6010
 Email: service@braunlawgroup.com

Janet Lindner Spielberg (Bar No. 221926)

LAW OFFICE OF JANET LINDNER SPIELBERG

12400 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 400

Los Angeles, CA 90025

Phone: (310) 392-8801

Fax: (310) 278-5938

Email: jlspielberg@jlslp.com

Counsel for Plaintiff

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA)
COUNTY OF ALLEGHENY) ss.:

I am employed in the County of Allegheny, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is 429 Forbes Avenue, Allegheny Building, 17th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219.

On July 2, 2013, I served the document(s) described as:

**PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION;
MEMORANDUM AND POINTS OF AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

[X] BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION USING THE COURT'S ECF SYSTEM: I caused the above document(s) to be transmitted by electronic mail to those ECF registered parties listed on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 5(d)(1) and by first class mail to those non-ECF registered parties listed on the Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF). *"A Notice of Electronic Filing (NEF) is generated automatically by the ECF system upon completion of an electronic filing. The NEF, when e-mailed to the e-mail address of record in the case, shall constitute the proof of service as required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 5(d)(1). A copy of the NEF shall be attached to any document served in the traditional manner upon any party appearing pro se."*

Executed July 2, 2013, at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

— s/Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.
Joseph N. Kravec, Jr.